

## **REMARKS**

1-26 are pending in the application. By the present amendment, claims 1, 10, 11, 17, and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection in view of the amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The following obviousness rejections are asserted:

- (i) Claims 1-6, 10-12, 16-24 and 26 are rejected as being unpatentable over Iyengar (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0172236) in view of Islam (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,132); and
- (ii) Claims 7-9, 14-15 and 25 are rejected as being unpatentable over Iyengar and Islam and further in view of Chang (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2005/0128960).


Applicants contend that at the very least, claims 1, 10, 11, 17 and 18 are patentable and non-obvious over the combination of Iyengar and Islam. For example, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Iyengar and Islam do not disclose or fairly suggest a method for maintaining consistency of stored objects which includes, for example, performing an updating process by instructing storage elements that may be storing a copy of the object (to be updated) to invalidate their copy of the object and then *delaying an updating of the object until it is determined that each storage element instructed to invalidate a copy of the object has either (i) acknowledged that it is not storing a valid copy of the object or (ii) been deemed unresponsive,* as essentially claimed in claims 1, 10, 11, 17 and 18.

In formulating the rejections, the Examiner seemingly relies on paragraph [0011] of Iyengar as generally disclosing that a central cache may communicate with local caches to make sure that copies of an object to be updated are invalidated. However, Iyengar does not

specifically teach that updating of the object is *delayed until it is determined that each storage element instructed to invalidate a copy of the object has either (i) acknowledged that it is not storing a valid copy of the object or (ii) been deemed unresponsive*, as recited in the claimed inventions. Moreover, the process of *delaying the update* as claimed is seemingly not disclosed in Islam.

In this regard, claims 1, 10, 11, 17 and 18 include features that are not disclosed or suggested by Iyengar and Islam, either singularly or in combination, and are thus, non-obvious over such combination. Given that all remaining obviousness rejections for those claims depending from independent claims 1, 10, 11, 17 and 18 are based directly or primarily on the combination of Iyengar and Islam as applied to the independent claims, all obviousness rejections are legally deficient for at least the same reasons given above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Frank V. DeRosa  
Registration No. 43,584

**Mailing Address:**

**KEUSEY, TUTUNJIAN & BITETTO, P.C.**  
**20 Crossways Park North, Suite 210**  
**Woodbury, NY 11797**  
**Tel: (516) 496-3868 Fax: (516) 496-3869**